

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA)

MSIP Year: 2002-2003

Report Summary: On-Site Visit

Total Number of Surveys:	Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC)			
Role of Person completing this survey:	Heart of Missouri-Columbia:	1	South Central Missouri:	1
Special Education Contact:	Southwest Missouri:	8	Southeast Missouri:	0
Superintendent:	Kansas City:	0	St. Louis:	2
Principal:	Northeast Missouri:	0	Central Missouri:	3
Other:	Northwest Missouri:	2		

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A. TRAINING/TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE					
1. SEMSA training workshops were helpful.	5	14	5	0	0
2. DESE provided timely and helpful responses to questions.	9	13	0	2	0
3. Compliance List Serv was helpful in answering questions.	2	9	8	4	1
B. WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS					
4. SEMSA instruction guidelines were helpful.	0	24	0	0	0
5. SEMSA instruction guidelines were user friendly.	0	21	1	2	0
C. SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS					
6. Data required to complete the self-monitoring review was easily accessible.	4	15	1	3	1
7. Amount of time required to complete the review was reasonable.	0	12	1	5	6
8. Electronic submission of data is an efficient way to send SEMSA data to DESE.	8	9	3	1	3
9. SEMSA process increased understanding of compliance requirements for special education.	7	13	2	1	1
10. SEMSA process is an effective way to assess student performance for students w/ disabilities.	1	8	3	8	4
11. SEMSA process has made district/agency more aware of performance of students w/disabilities.	1	11	5	5	2
12. SEMSA process helped accurately evaluate performance of students w/ disabilities.	0	8	6	7	3
13. SEMSA process is an effective way to assess compliance with state/federal regulations.	3	18	2	0	1
14. Time spent on the SEMSA process was beneficial.	2	11	5	4	2
D. FINAL REPORT AND LETTER					
15. Received final monitoring report/letter in reasonable length of time.	3	13	0	5	3
16. Final report/letter were user friendly.	2	16	2	3	1
E. CORRECTIVE ACTION/IMPROVEMENT PLANNING					
17. District/agency is aware of its areas of non-compliance.	8	15	0	0	1
18. District/agency is aware of what it needs to do to correct any areas of non-compliance.	6	14	1	1	1
F. ON-SITE PREPARATION AND VISIT					
19. Preparation for the on-site monitoring accomplished in reasonable amount of time.	0	12	4	5	3
20. On-site monitoring was beneficial.	4	13	6	0	1
21. On-site monitoring conducted in an efficient and effective manner.	7	10	6	1	0
22. DESE staff conducting on-site monitoring were knowledgeable.	12	8	4	0	0
23. DESE staff conducting on-site monitoring were professional.	12	6	5	1	0
24. DESE staff conducting the on-site monitoring were helpful.	12	5	6	1	0

25. How many staff were involved in the SEMSA self-monitoring review process?

Special Educators: 240 Administrators: 57 Support Staff: 41 Others: 24

26. How many total hours did it take to complete the SEMSA Review and Reporting:

Less than 20 hours: 2 21 to 30 hours: 5 31 to 40 hours: 7 More than 40 hours: 10

27. Did staff request assistance from a DESE special education Compliance supervisor during the SEMSA process?

Yes 17 No 7

Questions 28-31 are addressed on a separate report.